

REMARKS

Claims 1-6 are pending in this application, of which claim 1 has been amended. No new claims have been added.

Claims 1-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as indefinite.

In particular, the Examiner has complained that the claimed term “natural language” is not defined in the specification.

In response, it is respectfully submitted that the term “natural language” is well known in the art. It can refer to any of the languages generally spoken or written by humans, and would include, for example, English, French, German, Japanese, etc. In claim 1, “command terms indicated in a natural language” refers to text words that are words of a known standard human language. Clearly, depending on where the invention is to be used, this language could be any of a number of possible languages. Please see the attached definition of “Natural language” from Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia from the Internet.

Claim 1 has been amended to eliminate other noted instances of indefiniteness.

Claims 1-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by United States Patent No. [sic] 2004/0015832 to Stapp et al. (hereinafter, “**Stapp et al.**”).

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Regarding claim 1, the Examiner cites paragraph [0021] of **Stapp et al.** as disclosing the “storage device storing a plurality of templates” The Examiner refers, in particular, to the statement of “a pre-defined data structure to hold the input data that the code-generation

component requires.” However, this paragraph does not appear to specifically refer to any hardware, and no “storage device” is mentioned in paragraph [0021].

The Examiner refers to paragraph [0023] of **Stapp et al.**, which discloses “a means to modify and add templates for generating codes.” Again, this paragraph only generally discloses a “means,” but does not specifically disclose the apparatus structure.

The Examiner also refers to paragraph [0012] of **Stapp et al.**, which refers to a “pipes-and-filters mechanism for generating code.” However, again, there does not appear to be any particular disclosure of “a storage device” or “a display” in this paragraph. The concept of “pipes-and-filters” is explained in paragraphs [0077]-[0078], in which “pipe” is a communication, and “filter” is a module that takes input data and produces an output. Therefore, a “pipe” is not an apparatus, but a “filter” may be.

The Examiner further refers to paragraph [0073] of **Stapp et al.** This paragraph refers to a “UI” (user interface, see paragraphs [0070]-[0072]). Paragraph [0071] indicates that the UI has multiple screens; however, there does not appear to be a specific disclosure of a storage device.

Stapp et al. discloses a method that “provides a set of tasks that are carried out to transform data in successive steps of data conversion” (abstract). The reference refers to a “first specification language” (paragraph [0008]). This term is not clearly defined, but this does not appear to refer to a natural language.

One exemplary feature of the present invention is the template displayed by the display. The template of the present invention includes a selection area having a plurality of common

terms, and the plurality of common terms are indicated in a natural language. Therefore, a user with little knowledge of source codes can readily select a common term corresponding to a desired statement. Moreover, the template of the present invention includes the selection area, the plurality of input areas, and the command button. When the user selects the command term, inputs a necessary parameter in the input area, and selects a command button, the user can readily produce the desired statement and the apparatus of the present invention can readily generate a source code of the desired statement. The user can produce the desired statement using single template displayed at the display, so that the template displayed at the display does not have to be changed a number of times in order to produce the desired statement and the source code of the desired statement.

The Examiner cites paragraphs [0012] and [0023] of Staff et al. as disclosing the template of the present invention. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Staff et al. fails to disclose a template having a selection area, a plurality of input areas, and a command button according to the present invention. More specifically, paragraph [0023] of Staff et al. does not disclose screen layout like the template of the present invention having a plurality of selecting areas. Further, paragraph [0023] fails to disclose the plurality of command terms indicated in a natural language. Paragraph [0012] of Staff et al. also fails to disclose the screen layout. Therefore, paragraph [0012] does not disclose the input areas and the command button of the present invention.

As described above, Staff et al. fails to disclose the template having a selection area, a plurality of input areas, and a command button, as claimed in the instant application.

Staff et al. fails to teach the present invention. The present invention provides an apparatus that can readily generate a source code based on the selected or input statement expressed in a natural language in a single display screen image. In order to achieve this, the present invention has the template having the feature as described above. Staff et al. discloses the process of the code generation. However, Staff et al. fails to disclose a screen layout similar to the template of the present invention.

Thus, the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection should be withdrawn.

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, claims 1-6, as amended, are in condition for allowance, which action, at an early date, is requested.

If, for any reason, it is felt that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. **10/724,720**
Response to Office Action dated March 12, 2007

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, Applicant respectfully petitions for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fees for such an extension of time and any other fees which may be due with respect to this paper, to Deposit Account No. 01-2340.

Respectfully submitted,

ARMSTRONG, KRATZ, QUINTOS,
HANSON & BROOKS, LLP



William L. Brooks
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 34,129

WLB/ak
Atty. Docket No. **031299**
Suite 1000
1725 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 659-2930



23850

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

Enclosure: Attachment "Natural Language"

Q:\HOME\AKERR\WLB\03\031299\amendment june 2007